



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,910	12/19/2001	Shigeo Nakagaki	217656US-3TTC CONT	9815

7590

06/18/2003

Oblon Spivak McClelland Maier & Neustadt
Fourth Floor
1755 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22202

EXAMINER

TRAN, THUY VAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3652

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
10/020,910

Applicant(s)
Nakagaki et al.

Examiner
Thuy V. Tran

Art Unit
3652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 31, 2003
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3652

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 31, 2003 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-3 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. With regard to equations (1)-(6) on pages 9 & 10 of the specification where the **sum load is assumed to be vertical** (page 9, lines 1-2):

First, it is unclear what applicant meant by "If the connecting structure is a pivot connection, that is, a vertical displacement of the cage guide rail 110 is restricted, but a pivot

Art Unit: 3652

movement on the junction of the cage guide rail 110 and the bracket 1 is not restricted”, found on page 9, lines 9-11. If the only present load is a vertical load and the vertical displacement of the cage guide rail is restricted, then there should be no pivot movement on the junction of the cage guide rail and the bracket. Further, if the vertical displacement of the cage guide rail is restricted, then the guide rail ends is rigidly connected to the elevator shaft at at least one of its top and bottom. Thus, there should be no load at the junction of the cage guide rail and the bracket.

Secondly, as described by Applicant on page 9, lines 13-15 that “the connecting structure is a rigid connection, that is, both the vertical displacement of the cage guide rail 110 and the pivot movement are restricted”, and as discussed in the paragraph above with an addition of no pivotal movement, then there should be no bending moment working at the junction of the fastening plate 2 and the shaft wall 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 1-3 and 26 (as best understood) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al. 6,012,554 in view of one of Rousseau 4,593,794, Ericson et al. 4,848,519 and Koeppe, Jr. et al. 5,950,770.

Ito et al ‘554 disclose an elevator system comprising a driving unit 14, Figure 5, mounted on a guide rail 4 and configure to move a movable unit 1 up and down along the guide rail 4 via a

Art Unit: 3652

cable 13. The guide rail is installed on the elevator shaft via a plurality of rail support members which are fixed to a wall of the shaft.

Ito et al disclose all the claimed limitations except for how specifically the support members are secured to the wall.

Russeau '794 discloses an elevator guide rail 30 A, Figure 3, installed on an elevator shaft via a plurality of rail support members (portion perpendicular to shaft wall 32) fixed to a wall 32 of the shaft by means of at least two anchor bolts 84 separated from each other by an interval in the vertical direction, and wherein the anchor bolts comprise upper and lower pairs, each pair of the anchor bolts are separated by an interval in the horizontal direction, and further, the bolts are attached to a plurality of plates 80..

Ericson et al. '519 disclose an elevator guide rail 125, Fig. 1, installed on an elevator shaft via a plurality of rail support members, at least one the rail support member 260 fixed to a wall of the shaft by at least two anchor bolts separated from each other by an interval in the vertical direction, and wherein the anchor bolts comprise upper and lower pairs, each pair of the anchor bolts are separated by an interval in the horizontal direction.

Koeppel, Jr. et al. '770 disclose an elevator guide rail 1, Figures 1-5, installed on an elevator shaft via a plurality of rail support members, at least one the rail support member 9 fixed to a wall of the shaft by at least two anchor bolts 12 separated from each other by an interval in the vertical direction, and wherein the anchor bolts comprise upper and lower pairs, each pair of the anchor bolts are separated by an interval in the horizontal direction.

Art Unit: 3652

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to at the time the invention was made to secure the rail support members of Ito et al reference with at least two pairs of securing members separated with each other by an interval in both vertical and horizontal direction as disclosed by at least one of the above references, since it was known in the art that mounting the securing members by an interval in the vertical direction would prevent the support members from bending due to the total vertical load of the driving unit and the movable unit, and separating the securing members in the horizontal direction would prevent the support members from twisting due to the lateral movement of the movable unit.

Re the equation for calculating the safety range for the interval of the securing members, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to separate the securing members in the vertical direction within a safety range, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed March 31, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the description in the specification does not assume that the guide rail is connected/supported to the top or bottom of the shaft. It is understood the safety in the elevator art that a guide rail is at least supported by the floor of the

Art Unit: 3652

elevator shaft, e.g., Figure 8 of the present application. Thus, the bending moment in the vertical direction is nearly zero, and the only other concerned force is the buckling force (force acts in the horizontal direction).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one skill in the elevator art at the time the invention was made to have utilized mounting brackets with enough mounting members in order to resist the horizontal forces imposed due to uneven loading of the car.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Art Unit: 3652

Conclusion

7. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3652

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy v. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-2558.



EILEEN D. LILLIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

TVT (TVT)

June 16, 2003